

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The previous Office Action rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §101; rejected claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-5 and 7-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b); and rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant hereby amends claims 1-3, 11-17, and 19-21. No new matter is added.

Applicant also appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Seye and Examiner Zhen to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted on December 13, 2006. Applicant's Separate Record of Substance of Interview with Examiner is incorporated into the following remarks.

The following remarks are to supplement the Amendment filed in response to the August 29, 2006 Office Action. Arguments and remarks presented in the Amendment in response to the August 29 Office Action are incorporated herein by reference.

**I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejected claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Although the Office Action stated that claim 12 and 18 do not contain antecedent basis for the limitation "the degree of relation," the Examiner expressed during the interview that even as amended to recite "a degree of relation," claim 12 may still be confusing. Accordingly, claim 12, as agreed in the personal interview, has been amended to recite "a positional relationship to other objects." This amendment more fully clarifies and states concisely that the objects are displayed essentially according to their relative coordinates. Claim 18, as stated in the Amendment, contains no such limitation and thus has not been amended.

For at least these reasons, claims 12 and 18 are not indefinite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 7-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Toomey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,147; hereafter "Toomey"); and rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toomey in view of Weinberger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,258; hereafter "Weinberger").

During the personal interview, the Examiner expressed that 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections would likely be overcome by the amendments and remarks contained in the Amendment filed in response to the August 29, 2006 Office Action if the Applicant more fully distinguished the claimed "real space" from Toomey's *virtual space*. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 11, 13-17 and 19-21 each now recite "*non-simulated* real space."

This amendment clarifies that the claimed invention does not involve computer simulation, graphics, or avatars in order to display the compiled history data and relative orientation of objects in real spaces.

For at least these reasons, amended claims 1-5 and 7-21 are not anticipated by Toomey, nor would claim 6 have been rendered obvious by the combination of Toomey and Weinberger. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan C. Cady  
Registration No. 56,762

JAO:RCC/amw

Date: December 27, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--